REMARKS

At the time of the office action, claims 1, 3, 5, 7 to 10, 13, and 15 to 24 were pending in the application. Claims 1 to 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first and second paragraphs. Claims 1, 8 to 10, 18 to 20, and 24 were rejected as anticipated. Claims 3, 5, 7, 13, 15 to 17, and 21 to 23 were rejected as obvious.

Prior to considering the each of the rejections, Applicants note that an IDS was filed on by First Class Mail on November 9, 2005. Applicants received a return receipt postcard date stamped November 14, 2005 showing that the PTO received the IDS. A copy of the Form 1449 were not received with the instant action showing that the references were considered. If the IDS is not in the file, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned Attorney so that a copy can be forwarded to the PTO along with a copy of the date stamped return receipt postcard.

Claims 1 to 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs. To move the prosecution forward, Applicants have amended claims 1, 3, 8, 10, 13, 18, 21 and 24 to further define the generic format independent interface. In view of the § 112 rejections, the Examiner's attention is called to:

One important aspect of this invention is that each partial filter adapter utilizes the same generic format independent interface to receive input data. <u>Format independent here means that the interface is independent of the particular source and target formats as well as the underlying data formats associated with a particular partial filter adapter.</u> This allows any one partial filter adapter to be connected to another partial filter adapter <u>without concern for the particular underlying format of the data output by the first partial filter adapter.</u> In one embodiment, as explained more completely below, the generic format independent interface is a Simple API for XML (SAX) interface, and the data format of

GUNNISON, McKAY &
HODGSON, L.L.P.
Garden West Office Plaza
1900 Garden Road, Suite 220
Monterey, CA 93940
(831) 655-0880
Fax (831) 655-0888

Page 13 of 23

the input data is XML. The underlying data format is
defined by a Document Type Definition (DTD) identifier.
(Emphasis Added.)

Specification, Page 11, line 28 to page 12, line 7

Thus, the specification specifically teaches what "format
independent" means and provides a specific definition. It
should be unnecessary to move the definition of "format
independent" into the claim in view of the recent CAFC rulings
and the MPEP. Nevertheless, the definition has been added to
the claim language. Amending a claim to include language that
was implicit in the original claim language should not affect
the patentability of the claim.

The Examiner's attention is also called to the numerous
examples and illustrations in the description. For example,
Fig. 2 illustrates the use of the generic format independent
interface for partial filter adapters that have a variety of
underlying data formats, a source data format and a target data
format. In each instance the interface is illustrated as
receiving input data having an underlying input data format.
For example, for adapter 203, the underlying data input format
is the source data format and the underlying data output format
is "StarOffice_Calc" data format. For adapter 240, the
underlying data input format is the "StarOffice_Calc" data
format and the underlying data output format is RTF data
format. Figs. 6A to 6C provide further examples of the
underlying data formats for various partial filter adapters.
Accordingly, when the claims are read in view of the
specification and the level of skill in the art, one of skill
can determine the metes and bounds of the invention.

Moreover, the definitions and the numerous examples teach
one of skill how to make and use the invention. The MPEP
directs:

. . . A specification disclosure which contains a
teaching of the manner and process of making and using an

invention in terms which correspond in scope to those used
in describing and defining the subject matter sought to be
patented must be taken as being in compliance with the
enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph,
unless there is a reason to doubt the objective truth of
the statements contained therein which must be relied on
for enabling support.

MPEP § 2164.04, 8th Ed. Rev. 3, p. 2100-197 (August 2005).

The § 112, first paragraph rejection did not even address
the disclosure and instead stated:

> If it is not known what is meant by "a generic data
> format independent interface", as indicated above, then it
> seems unlikely that one of ordinary skill in the art would
> be able to make or use such an interface with out undue
> experimentation.

This fails to address the explicit definitions and
examples as cited above, and fails to provide a proper basis
for the rejection. Further, Figures 7A to 7D and the related
description provide a specific embodiment of the invention.
For example, the specification stated:

> In this embodiment, each partial filter adapter, in
> turn, uses the same generic interface *XDocumentHandler* to
> pass the data stream to the next partial filter adapter.
> In this embodiment, XML data is used to implement the
> generic format independent interface between the partial
> filter adapters. Specifically, each partial filter
> adapter component forwards the (partially) converted data
> to the next partial filter adapter component in the chain
> by using interface *XDocumentHandler*. The interfaces
> between the partial filter adapter components in this
> chain are the same and independent from the concrete
> document type.
>   The use of interface *XDocumentHandler* in the partial
> filter adapters is illustrative only and is not intended
> to limit the invention to this specific interface. Other
> similar interfaces may be used. Each partial filter
> adapter can be, for example, hard coded, or can be
> implemented by XSLT transformations, using an XSL
> processor and XSL transformation descriptions.

Specification, Page 28, lines 4 to 22.

Consequently, an interface *XDocumentHandler* was identified as the generic data format independent interface. The description provided with respect to interface *XDocumentHandler* included:

> Interface *XDocumentHandler* (Table 8) also inherits from interface *XInterface* (Table 2). Interface *XDocumentHandler* receives notification of general document events. In this embodiment, interface *XDocumentHandler* includes methods startDocument, endDocument, startElement, endElement, characters, ignorableWhitespace, processingInstruction, and setDocumentLocator. Each of these methods can raise an exception SAXException. One embodiment of exception SAXException is presented in Table 9.
> Method startDocument receives notification of the beginning of a document. Method endDocument receives notification of the end of a document.
> Method startElement receives notification of the beginning of an element. Input parameter aName contains the name of the tag. Input parameter xAttribs contains an interface to the list of attributes given in the tag. Note that for every call of the method, the same instance may be passed. So one must make copy of the instance to store the information.
> Method endElement receives notification of the end of an element. Method characters receives notification of character data. Method ignorableWhitespace receives notification of white space that can be ignored. Method processingInstruction receives notification of a processing instruction. Method setDocumentLocator receives an object for locating the origin of SAX document events.

TABLE 8:   Interface *XDocumentHandler*

```
interface XDocumentHandler:
                    com::sun::star::uno::XInterface
{
void startDocument()
    raises( com::sun::star::xml::sax::SAXException );
void endDocument()
    raises( com::sun::star::xml::sax::SAXException );
void startElement( [in] string aName,
```

```
            [in] com::sun::star::xml::sax::XAttributeList
        xAttribs )
            raises(
            com::sun::star::xml::sax::SAXException );
void endElement( [in] string aName )
        raises( com::sun::star::xml::sax::SAXException );
void characters( [in] string aChars )
        raises( com::sun::star::xml::sax::SAXException );
void ignorableWhitespace( [in] string aWhitespaces )
        raises( com::sun::star::xml::sax::SAXException );
void processingInstruction( [in] string aTarget,
                                    [in] string aData )
            raises(
            com::sun::star::xml::sax::SAXException );
void setDocumentLocator(
        [in] com::sun::star::xml::sax::XLocator xLocator )
        raises( com::sun::star::xml::sax::SAXException );
};
```

Specification, Page 38, line 9 to Page 40, line2.

Thus, not only were definitions and examples provided but a specific structure and description of the interface werep provided. Accordingly, not only did the § 112, first paragraph rejection fail to meet the requirements of the MPEP, but also the rejection demonstrated that the claims were not read in view of the description as required by the MPEP. The MPEP further addressed this issue:

> As stated by the court, "it is incumbent upon the Patent Office, whenever a rejection on this basis is made, to explain *why* it doubts the truth or accuracy of any statement in a supporting disclosure and to back up assertions of its own with acceptable evidence or reasoning which is inconsistent with the contested statement. Otherwise, there would be no need for the applicant to go to the trouble and expense of supporting his presumptively accurate disclosure."

MPEP § 2164.04, 8th Ed. Rev. 3, p. 2100-197 (August 2005).

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112, second paragraph rejection of Claims 1, 3, 5, 7 to 10. 13. 15 to 19, and 21 to 24. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal

of the § 112, first paragraph rejection of Claims 1, 3, 5, 7 to 10. 13. 15 to 24.

With respect to the § 112, second paragraph rejection of Claim 24, Applicants have amended the claim to make clear what was implicit in the claim. Applicants further note that the language rejected was in the claim as filed and is being raised for the first time in this action. This demonstrates that apparently the claim language was previously understood. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112, rejection of Clam 24.

Claims 7, 17, and 22 have been amended to correct informalities introduced by the amendments to the claims from which each depends.

Claim 20 is amended to include definitions from the description. The rejection continued to treat explicit claim limitations as descriptive and so failed to interpret the limitations in view of the description. The section of the MPEP cited to support this level of claim analysis was not a section of the MPEP directed to interpreting structure claims but rather at the weight given to printed matter such as instructions for using a kit. The structure of Claim 20 does not include printed matter and so the cited section of the MPEP does not provide a basis for the rejection.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 8 to 10, 13, 15, 16, 18 to 21, and 24 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,012,098, hereinafter referred to a Bayeh.

Applicants respectfully traverse the anticipation rejection of Claim 1. The rejection still has not cited any interface for passing data from a partial filter adapter to another partial filter adapter as recited in Claim 1. Moreover, Claim 1 recites:

a chain of said plurality of partial filter adapters

Bayeh describes a servlet chain that has a data servlet and a rendering servlet. Apparently, this is what is being cited as a plurality of partial filter adapters. However, each of the servlets, as described by Bayeh, does not have an interface as recited in Claim 1. This is because Bayeh is solving a different problem isolating "data retrieval from data presentation formatting." Bayeh taught:

> The role of the data servlet is only to retrieve data from a database 88': it does no presentation formatting of that retrieved data. The data servlet 83 receives the search request 80', queries a database 88' using database query statements 86' appropriate to the particular database, and receives the query results 90'. At that point, the data retrieval function of the data servlet 83 is complete.

Bayeh, Col. 8, lines 7 to 12.

Bayeh further taught:

> At Step 240, the data servlet processes the client request. The request will typically require retrieving data from some database available to the data servlet. The data servlet will format a database query request, using an appropriate query language that will depend on the type of database on which the relevant data is stored. Database query languages are well known in the art, as are techniques for determining which language is required and how to format queries in a particular language. The creation of the query request, as well as sending the request to the database and receiving data satisfying that request, do not form part of the inventive concepts of the present invention. Techniques are used which are well known in the art.

Bayeh, Col. 10, lines 46 to 58.

Thus, the functions described in these quotes from Bayeh fail to teach that the data servlet includes any type of interface for receiving input data as recited in Claim 1. The rejection has cited no teaching that the data servlet is used for other than retrieving data using an appropriate query

language and then formatting that data specifically for the next servlet. Bayeh provides no detail on whether there is an interface and teaches only that the input data is obtained using known database retrieval techniques. Moreover, there is no teaching that any interface associated with database retrieval techniques is also utilized in the rendering servlet to receive input data.

Claim 1 recites that

> each partial filter adapter includes a generic source and target data formats independent interface (Emphasis Added.)

Since, the rejection has not cited any generic interface in the data servlet of Bayeh for receiving input data that is also found in the rendering servlet of Bayeh, Bayeh fails to show the identical invention **in as complete detail** as is contained in the claim. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 1.

Claims 8 to 10, 18, 19, and 24 stand rejected as anticipated by Bayeh. Each of Claims 8 to 10, 18, 19, and 24 includes limitations similar to that noted above with respect to Claim 1 and so the remarks concerning Claim 1 and Bayeh are directly applicable to the rejection of each of these claims and are incorporated herein by reference. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 8 to 10, 18, 19, and 24.

With respect to Claim 20, the rejection has failed to cite any teaching of the conversion service, protocol reader or chain factory as recited in Claim 20. Accordingly, a prima facie anticipation rejection with respect to Claim 20 has not been established. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 20.

Claims 3, 5, 13, 15 to 16, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bayeh in view of Official Notice.

Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness rejection of Claim 3. Claim 3 includes limitations similar to that noted above with respect to Claim 1 and so the remarks concerning Claim 1 and Bayeh are directly applicable to the rejection of Claim 3 and are incorporated herein by reference. The additional information cited in Official Notice does not correct the deficiency of Bayeh and so assuming the combination were correct, Claim 3 distinguishes over the combination.

Further, a device is not a browser and so the official notice is unrelated to Claim 3. Further, Bayeh taught:

> . . . Because browsers expect <u>an incoming response to be formatted using HTML</u>, servers generate their response in that format. (Emphasis Added.)

Bayeh, Col. 2, lines 52 to 54

and

> This is necessary because browsers, by convention, expect to receive data that has been formatted with HTML.

Bayeh, Col. 11, lines 37, 38.

The Official Notice contradicts the express teaching of Bayeh that establishes the level of skill in the art. Accordingly, without support, the Official Notice is not appropriate and so the use of Official Notice is traversed as being contradictory of the teachings of Bayeh. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of Claim 3.

Claim 5 depends from Claim 3 and so distinguishes over Bayeh for at least the same reasons as Claim 3. Applicants

request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 5.

Claim 13 includes selecting one data format from at least two data formats supported by a process. Thus, the above comments with respect to Claim 3 are also applicable to Claim 13 and are incorporated herein by reference. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 13.

Claims 15 and 16 depend from Claim 13 and so distinguish over the various combinations with Bayeh for at least the same reasons as Claim 13. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 15 to 16.

Claim 21 includes limitations similar to Claim 3 and so the above remarks with respect to Claim 3 are incorporated herein by reference. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of Claim 21.

Claims 7, 17, 22 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bayeh in view of Garshol, "Free XML Software," (12/15/1999).

Assuming arguendo the combination of references is correct and the Examiner's interpretation of the secondary reference is correct, the additional information cited by the Examiner fails to overcome the basic deficiencies of Bayeh as noted above for the claims upon which each of Claims 7, 17, 22 and 23 depend. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of each of Claims 7, 17, 22 and 23.

//
//
//
//
//
//

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7 to 10, 13, and 15 to 24 remain in the application. Claims 1, 3, 7, 8, 10, 13, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, and 24 are amended. Claims 2, 4, 6, 11, 12, and 14 were canceled previously. For the foregoing reasons, Applicant(s) respectfully request allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions relating to the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned Attorney for Applicant(s).

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on **February 1, 2006**.

Respectfully submitted,

Forrest Gunnison
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 32,899
Tel.: (831) 655-0880

Attorney for Applicant(s)	**February 1, 2006** Date of Signature

GUNNISON, McKAY &
HODGSON, L.L.P.
Garden West Office Plaza
1900 Garden Road, Suite 220
Monterey, CA 93940
(831) 655-0880
Fax (831) 655-0888